

Supply

the Iron Curtain and Libya have been invited. This means that we will have people from certain Latin American countries, Central American countries, African and Asian countries, countries which have long histories of human rights abuses. It means we will have people in attendance who are at present actively engaged in regional wars. In other words, through this exposition we will be allowing countries whose domestic and foreign policies are opposed by the Canadian Government to look at and be able to place orders for military hardware. This hardware, in turn, will be used to suppress their own population and, in other cases, to be used to conduct the wars they are involved in.

• (1020)

The ARMX Conference was originally organized by the Liberals in 1983 and has been an ongoing biennial fair. This is the second time that it has now been contracted out. It has been contracted out to the division of *Baxter Publication* of Toronto which produces the trade journal of the Armed Forces, *The Canadian Defence Quarterly*, *Defence Publications Limited*.

To suggest as the Government has done, particularly the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) in a letter to my colleague from Brant (Mr. Blackburn), that the Canadian Government is not directly involved in ARMX is to side-step the issue. Let there be no doubt that if the Canadian Armed Forces were not there as participants, as buyers, ARMX would not exist this year. ARMX in the past would not have existed. Without the support of the Canadian Armed Forces, this arms exposition would be a non-starter.

This Government, as previous Liberal governments, has supported the arms industry through its DIPP program, the Defence Industry Productivity Program, through which arms producers and manufacturers receive certain subsidies. There are those arms manufacturers who are now paying *Baxter Publication* for the right to exhibit their wares.

The Canadian Government is indeed involved in helping to finance ARMX through the participation of the Canadian Defence Department, as well as through

grants and subsidies to the defence industry through the DIPP program.

We have seen this Government concentrate on the defence industry as a means of its industrial strategy. I want to speak for a few minutes on the folly of that strategy.

Several countries have been seduced by cheap profits and quick industrial development by attempting to grab a bigger share of the world's military budget.

We know that dependence on the military, especially for a medium power like Canada, is wrought with danger. We will mainly manufacture for the American defence market. The Americans will be and are our major customer. As such, we are dependent upon the Americans, which in turn undermines our ability to formulate an independent Canadian foreign policy. Because of our dependence on a single market, we lose our ability to formulate a more independent stance. We lose our sovereignty.

Second, one must question the morality of encouraging the production, the creation of jobs and the productivity in the country of instruments that are essentially made to kill people. Surely, there is something immoral about devising an economic strategy based on instruments of death. For this Government, as it has done over the last number of years, to encourage this sector of the economy, when there is such tremendous need for goods and services that help people rather than kill people, I maintain is immoral.

For example, in this year some \$250 million will be going in DIPP Grants. This is compared with the 1984-85 Budget of \$153 million, when this Government was first elected. In other words, over a short period of time this Budget has increased by over \$100 million per year. At the same time, we see cut-backs to regional development programs, to funding in health, education and social programs, right down the road. All the human programs are being cut back in the name of fighting the deficit, while there are programs to create instruments of death and the funding for those programs have increased. We find that immoral, Mr. Speaker, and that is what we condemn.

The other point I wish to raise is our history in terms of selling to those countries that abuse human rights. We have heard the Secretary of State for External Affairs